

**Application No.: 10/602,062**

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The attached sheet of drawings include changes to Fig. 4. The replacement sheet replaces original Fig. 4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

## REMARKS

### Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated May 1, 2007, Applicants have amended the drawings, and claims 1, 3, and 4. Dependent claim 5 has been added. Support for amended claim 1 is found in, for example, Figs. 4, 5A, and 5B; pg. 16, line 5-pg. 17, line 15. Claims 3 and 4 are amended to correct a typographical error. Care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new matter. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

### Drawings

The drawings were objected to failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "121" has been used to designate both the control unit and the image memory. The drawings, including Fig. 4, have been amended to label the control unit with --120--.

Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

### Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as purportedly being indefinite. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot in view of the amendment to claim 1.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,977,832 (hereinafter Walter).

Amended claim 1 recites, in part, "...a control unit for displaying images of the plurality of key control switches on the touch sensitive control panel, and superimposing an image of the pattern of the produced print on the images of the plurality of key control switches on the touch sensitive control panel by using the image data."

Walter describes scanning a **hard copy image** to be displayed as a pattern on a monitor (col. 1, lines 48-53). Although Walter describes displaying the scan of the **hard copy image** on the same screen that displays the control information in Walter, this image does not contain the same image data as the original print. The image data of Walter is processed and converted to a **hard copy image** when printed. Thus, the image data before printing is different from the image data of a scanned hard copy image.

According to the claimed subject matter per amended claim 1, the control unit superimposes images from the key control switches with an image of the pattern of the produced print by using the image data, and displays the superimposed images on the control panel. As shown in Fig. 4, the image data is stored in the image memory 121 before being printed. Thereby as taught in the instant specification, the image of the pattern can be displayed on the control panel in a color substantially equal to the color of a print to be printed by the claimed printing machine (*see, e.g.*, pg. 15, line 21-pg. 16, line 4). However, Walter does not disclose or suggest this, and apparently is unaware that the operator of the printing machine can accurately adjust the opening degrees of the ink keys *after* reviewing the displayed image of the key control switches and the image of the produced print superimposed on this image on the control panel,

but *prior* to printing a hard copy. Thus, the operator can start printing after setting desired values for the opening degrees of the respective ink keys while viewing the image of the print displayed on the control panel. Such adjustment is not viable in Walter.

Walter fails to disclose or suggest, "...a control unit for displaying images of the plurality of key control switches on the touch sensitive control panel, and superimposing an image of the pattern of the produced print on the images of the plurality of key control switches on the touch sensitive control panel by using the image data," as recited in amended claim 1.

With respect to independent claim 3, the Office Action asserted that Walter discloses a control unit for displaying, in superimposition on the control panel, key control switches for adjusting the opening degrees of the ink keys. As discussed previously, Walter describes scanning the actual image pattern from a **hard copy image** of the printed form to be reviewed again by the pressman on the control information screen (col. 1, lines 48-50). Thus, the image was processed, *i.e.*, printed, before the control unit displays in superimposition on the control panel, key control switches, the color density, and the image of the print being processed.

Walter fails to disclose or suggest, "...a control unit for displaying, in superimposition on said control panel, key control switches for adjusting the opening degrees of said ink keys, the color density of said print measured by said color density measuring unit, and the image of said print being processed," as recited in amended claim 3.

As anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element of the claim be disclosed, either expressly or inherently (noting that "inherency may not be established by probabilities or possibilities," *Scaltech Inc. v. Retec/Tetra*, 178 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 1999), in a single prior art reference, *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Commission*, 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir.

1986), based on the foregoing, it is submitted that Walter does not anticipate claims 1 and 3 nor any claim dependent thereon.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is respectfully requested.

**New Claim**

New claim 5 recites, "...the control unit displays images of the plurality of key control switches corresponding to the collection of key control switches are arranged two dimensionally, the images of the plurality of key control switches corresponding to the same ink key area are arranged horizontally, and the images of the plurality of key control switches corresponding to the ink keys feeding the same ink are arranged vertically on the touch sensitive control panel." Nothing in the cited reference teaches or suggests the described subject matter. It is submitted that this new dependent claim is distinguishable over the cited reference.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

**Application No.: 10/602,062**

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Lisa A. Kilday  
Registration No. 56,210

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB:LAK:mjb  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: August 1, 2007**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**

WDC99 1429435-1.058604.0028